DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 050 206 UD 011 495

AUTHOR Kim, Yoon Hough
TITLE Neighborhood Context and Racial Attitudes.
PUB DATE May 71
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at 34th Annual Meeting of the Southern Sociological Society, Miami, Fla., May 1971

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Caucasians, *Neighborhood Integration, *Racial Attitudes, *Racial Discrimination, Residential Patterns, *Socioeconomic Influences, Southern Attitudes

ABSTRACT

Using a random sample of 231 married white women in a Southern town, contextual effects of 3 neighborhood variables were investigated in this study. Socioeconomic status (SES), racial composition, and residential mobility were defined, and their effect on racial attitudes was determined. It was found that: (1) high SES housewives were less prejudiced against blacks than low SES wives; (2) neighborhood SES affects racial attitudes, and is greater when neighborhood interaction is active; and, (3) those living in nearly desegregated neighborhoods which are stable are more prejudiced against blacks. (Author/DM)

ED050206

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

NEIGHBORHOOD CONTEXT AND RACIAL ATTITUDES

YOON HOUGH KIM

East Carolina University

Presented at the 34th Annual Meeting of the Southern Sociological Society, Miami, Florida, May 1971.

UD011495

NEIGHBORHOOD CONTEXT AND RACIAL ATTITUDES

Yoon Hough Kim
East Carolina University

(Abstract)

Possible contextual effects of three selected neighborhood variables - socioeconomic status, racial composition, and residential mobility - on racial attitudes of whites toward blacks were investigated with the data from a random sample of 231 married white women in a Southern town. Neighborhood was defined as a residential block, and neighborhood socioeconomic status was measured by arithmetic mean of the occupational prestige scores of the household heads in the block, using the NORC scale. Racial composition was indexed by the proportion of the households headed by black persons in the block, and residential mobility of neighborhood was the proportion of the households that moved to the community within the past ten years or/and plan to move from the community within a foreseeable future. Racial attitude was measured by a Likert scale of 28 items, including the 16 items from the Anti-Negro Scale by Steckler. In actual analysis of the data, these variables were either dichotomized or trichotomized, and chi-square, gamma, and the Dorn-Stouffer-Tibbits-Goodman Test were used in drawing conclusions. The major findings of the study are as follows:

(1) High SES white housewives are less prejudiced against the black than low SES white housewives, regardless of their neighborhood SES.

(2) Those white housewives living in high SES neighborhoods are less prejudiced against the black than those in low SES neighborhoods, regardless of their individual SES.

(3) Neighborhood SES has a contextual effect on racial attitudes of low SES white housewives toward the black above and beyond the effects of their individual variables.

(4) The above contextual effect of neighborhood SES is greater when neighborhood interaction is active than when it is inactive.

(5) Those white housewives living in nearly desegregated neighborhoods are more prejudiced against the black than those in segregated or desegregated neighborhoods.

(6) Mobile white housewives are less prejudiced than stable housewives; and those white housewives in mobile neighborhoods are less prejudiced against the black than those in stable neighborhoods. The relationships, however, disappear when their individual mobility and/or neighborhood mobility are controlled.

1. The Problem

The major objective of the present study is to examine three selected contextual variables of neighborhoods - socioeconomic status, racial composition, and residential mobility - for their possible bearing on racial attitudes of whites toward the black through an empirical investigation. The basic assumption underlying the study is that intergroup relations, such as race relations, are not merely structured by the orientations of individuals who constitute the groups - the term "group" is used loosely. Rather, it is assumed that there are social processes at work involving collective definitions of situations, which exert social controls upon the individuals in the situations.

In the process of accepting collective definitions of situations as to race, individuals may take over and internalize norms provided by groups, and these norms may eventually integrated into their racial attitudes. It is important, however, to point out that even before the individual is thus socialized in different contexts, his current environment often exerts external constraints, to use Durkheim's words, upon individuals, because people tend to conform to the normative climates of their contexts, even when these climates are not in full accordance to their personal orientations, in order to gain social approval. While many sociologists have paid their attention to such contextual effects under various labels, such as group effects, structual effects, contextual effects, compositional effects, and others,[1] ever

---

* I am indebted to Professors K. L. Sindwani and Ralph R. Napp and those former graduate and undergraduate students of East Carolina University who participated in various stages of the survey whose findings are summarized in this paper.

[1] For an early discussion of such effects see Durkheim (1950), Robinson (1950), Kendall and Lazarsfeld (1950), Lohman and Reitzes (1952), Coleman (1958), Blau (1960), Davis (1961), and Lazarsfeld and Menzel (1961).

since Durkheim's days, there is surprisingly little empirical evidence for them, particularly at lower levels, such as at the neighborhood level.

Contextual analysis is defined here, following Sills (1961:572), as "characterizing individuals by some characteristic of the group to which they belong (the context), and then noting how individuals who are similar in other ways differ in their opinions or behavior in accordance with the group context in which they are located." This approach is different from the traditional analysis of individual attitudes or behavior in terms of his "background" factors, such as education, occupation, religion, or social mobility. In contextual analysis individuals are located in their current group situations and their contextual effects are established when the contextual variables explain the variation of individual attitudes or behavior above and beyond that explained by the individual background variables. In this sense, most of the empirical studies of racial attitudes and behavior in the existing sociological literature, many of which will be reviewed in this paper, are not contextual analyses. Neither can those early studies that took up such a context as neighborhood as an explanatory variable of individual racial attitudes but failed to analyze them in distinction from individual variables (cf. Saenger and Shulman, 1948 and Reitzes, 1953) be called contextual analyses.

Contextual analysis is also different from ecological analysis, which analyzes individual attitudes or behavior in terms of their geographical relationships.[2] A good example of ecological analysis of racial attitudes in recent years is Schuman and Gruenberg's study of the impact of city on racial attitudes (Schuman and Gruenberg, 1970). Based on the data from fifteen leading American cities, the authors concluded that "city of residence accounts for significant proportions of variance in a wide range of

---

[2] Robinson (1950) criticized the so-called ecological fallacy.

attitudes - proportion not greatly different from those accounted for by five individual background variables (age, sex, education, income, and occupation) and largely indepedent of these background variables." (Schuman and Gruenberg: 1970, 213) While these studies, particularly when they reveal some ecological correlations which are different from individual correlations, are doubtless very important in inderstanding human attitudes and behavior, they cannot be a substitute for sociological contextual analysis. Their conclusions are most often unamenable to interpretation because of the composite nature of geographical areas. The social processes through which ecological areas affect individuals are usually not clear.

There are also a large number of sociological and social psychological studies with experimental dosigns that have taken up immediate situations as a variable to explain oft-reported inconsistency between verbal attitudes and overt behavior in race relations.[3] Fendrich (1967), for instance, examined the paired associations among verbal attitudes, commitment and overt behavior to find that verbal attitudes were either consistent or inconsistent with overt behavior depending upon how the investigator structured the experimental situation in which verbal attitudes were measured. Likewise, Warner and DeFleur (1969), based on their experimental data from 537 students, reported that the effect of situational variables on the relationship between a verbal attitude and overt behavior toward the object of that attitude depends on the amount of social distance and social constraint present in the situation.

---

[3] There are numerous studies on this subject starting with the pioneer experiment by LaPiere (LaPiere, 1934). For a review of this interesting discussion see Deutcher (1966).

Similarly, a number of social psychological experiments pointed out the importance of social settings in explaining the relationship between prejudice and discrimination. The social situations or settings considered in these studies, however, are often concrete situations, and their findings, while most interesting, cannot always be translated back to patterned social situations, such as neighborhoods.

The actual direction and strength of these and other contextual effects upon individual racial attitudes, if present, must depend on a number of factors, including the kind of social contexts, prevailing norms therein, social postions of individuals in the situation, etc., which must be determined empirically in each case. There is little theoretical basis to assume that certain contexts would affect individuals in certain ways.[4] In the present study, residential neighborhoods in a Southern city with a population of about 32,000 were taken up as a context and an attempt was made to account for the variation of racial attitudes of the white residents in these neighborhoods toward the black by three selected neighborhood variables - socioeconomic status, racial composition, and residential mobility - as previously noted.

Socioeconomic status of neighborhood, it is argued here, reflects the shared norms of its residents and would have an important contextual effect on racial attitudes of the residents. There are a substantial number of sociological studies that established socioeconomic status of <u>individual</u>

---

4 Sewell and Armer (1966), for instance, reported that neighborhoods have no contextual effect upon adolescent educational aspirations, while Wilson (1959) and Coleman (1966) reported that schools and classes as social contexts have such effects upon students' educational aspirations.

as an important factor in explaining his racial or ethnic attitudes. The linkage may be through different socialization processes in different socioeconomic strata, or it may be due to the fact that members of different socioeconomic strata experience different amounts of competition, economic or otherwise, with members of other races or ethnic groups. Thus, Tumin (1958), for instance, in a study of North Carolina white male adults' attitudes toward the black, found that the higher the status the lower the expressed prejudice with respect to action-oriented questions (but not necessarily with respect to their stereotypes or images of the black). Similarly, Williams (1964), in the Cornell University study of New York and Georgia concluded that middle and upper class gentiles are more likely prejudiced against Jews than their fellows in the less affluent and less educated classes. In contrast, they reported that the poor whites are more prejudiced against the black than the white in more affluent strata. Sheatsley (1966), likewise, reported that regardless of race the social distance scores of middle-class respondents were lower than those of lower-class respondents based on the data gathered by the National Opinion Research Center (NORC). These studies and others[5] seem to suggest that the white individuals with high socioeconomic backgrounds are less prejudiced against the black (at least they answer questions in a more tolerant way) than those with lower socioeconomic backgrounds.

Socioeconomic status of neighborhood as a contextual variable with respect to individual racial attitudes, however, has been explored very little. Saenger and Shulman (1948), Reitzes (1952), and Northwood (1958) have taken up neighborhood as a context, but their studies have a limited relevance to

---

[5] For earlier studies on this subject see Triandis and Triandis (1960), Hunt (1960), Hamblin (1962-63), and Landis et al. (1966).

the present study, because the contextual effects have not been establish beyond those of component individual variables. Individuals with low socio-economic status living in a high socioeconomic neighborhood may very well be influenced differently by neighborhood contexts from those with low socioeconomic status but living in a low socioeconomic neighborhood. Blau (1960) demonstrated a similar contextual effect with the data from a public assistance agency. He showed that the individuals with pro-clinet attitudes were more often service oriented in their work than others, but also tha t these pro-client workers are more service-oriented if they are in pro-client groups than similarly oriented workers in groups with other orientations.

If or when there is a contextual effect of neighborhood socioeconomic status, there is another important sociological question to be answered. It is the question of through what process the effect is channeled to individuals. It is argued here that the effect is channeled through neighborhood interaction among residents. To the degree that this is a correct assumption, it is expected that the contextual effect of neighborhood socioeconomic status, if it is present, is greater when individuals are interacting actively with their neighbors than when neighborhood interaction is inactive.[6]

The second neighborhood contextual variable considered is racial composition of the neighborhood. It is obvious that one's own racial identity has an important bearing on his own interracial attitudes. This study, however, focuses upon racial attitudes of whites toward the black. Individual racial differences, therefore, have been controlled in the process of sampling.

---

[6] It must be pointed out here that the possible causal sequence between neighborhood interaction and individual racial attitudes can go in either direction - either more interaction leads to more homogenaous attitudes or more homogenaous attitudes lead to more interaction among them.

The racial factor was instead considered as racial composition of neighborhood. The relationship between the relative size of ~~the~~ blacks in a community (or in a neighborhood) and racial attitudes of the whites in the area is another dark area where ~~there is~~ very little empirical knowledge has been accumulated. Blalock (1957 and 1967) noted, based on the census data from 245 Southern counties, that there is a nonlinear correlation between per cent nonwhite and a measure of educational differentials between whites and nonwhites. He, however, hastened to specify the relationship by other variables such as existing inter-group relation, amount of threat presented by the minority group involved, etc. Based on his data and more recent data on educational desegregation in the South, one may get an idea that there are more prejudice and discrimination against the black in those areas containing the largest proportions of the black minority.

The problem, however, is more complex than this for the following reasons: First, in most American cities, particularly in the South, there is not much variation in neighborhood racial composition, which means that racial composition is hardly a variable.[7] Second, racial composition of neighborhood can hardly be separated, theoretically or empirically, from socioeconomic status of the neighborhood. Almost always desegregated neighborhoods are low-status neighborhoods and their contextual effects, if any, must be very much confounded with those of neighborhood socioeconomic status. Finally, when neighborhood interaction is brought into the analysis as an intervening variable, as previously suggested, this will further confound the possible contextual effects of racial composition and those of interracial contact,[8] which will tend to increase as a result of neighborhood desegregation in most cases. Accordingly,

---

[7] See Taeuber and Taeuber (1965).

[8] For a discussion of the effect of interracial contact see Stouffer et al. (1949), Allport (1958), Deutsch and Collin (1951), and Cook (1962).

in a survey research such as the present study, it should be noted from the outset that whatever conclusions are drawn on this problem must be interpreted with caution.

The third contextual variable of neighborhood considered is residential mobility. Traditionally, sociologists have paid much more attention to social (vertical) mobility than to residential (horizontal) mobility in accounting for racial attitudes. Starting with the classic study of Bettelheim and Janowitz (1964), a number of studies have established some linkages between individual social mobility and his attitudes toward racial or ethnic minorities.[9] Social mobility, however, is presumably related to residential mobility, and both social and residential mobility are presumably related to socioeconomic status of the individual. Furthermore, neighborhood interaction cannot be independent of residential mobility of the people involved in the interaction. The problem, therefore, is again not simple to explain. Neither is the direction of possible contextual effects of neighborhood residential mobility, if any, predictable. Both upward mobility and downward mobility, which are not related to racial attitudes in the same way, tend to lead to more residential mobility.

The major dependent variable in the present study is, as previously noted, racial attitudes of whites toward the black. While one's racial attitudes are not always consistent with his racial behavior, one must not overlook that any cursory review of the existing sociological literature on the subject would reveal that there is some causal linkage between the two, even if the direction may be in either way.[10] Or, following Webb et al. (1970),

---

9 For an early discussion of this relationship see Greenblum and Pearlin (1953), Blau (1956), Silberstein and Seeman (1959), Packard (1959), Hamblin (1962-1963), and Hodge and Treiman (1966).

10 There seems to be more truism, as Pettigrew (1966) and others pointed out, to argue from behavior to attitudes, rather than from attitudes to behavior in race relations.

one may raise a basic question about the validity of interview data, such as used in this study, in measuring racial a ttitudes - attitude defined as an established tendency to react toward or against something or sombbody. It may be that any interview situation should be regarded as a behavioral situation as far as the respondent is concerned, and his responses in presence of the interviewer should be treated as verbal behavioral data rather than attitudinal data. This is, however, largely a semantic matter. It is with these qualifications that the major dependent variable is said to be racial attitudes.

2. Research Design

The data in the present study came from a random sample of 231 white married women living in a Southern community. Originally, a total of 241 households were drawn using a table of random numbers from all the residential blocks, except all-black blocks, in the community. In each household thus selected the lady of the house was interviewed for approximately one hour by the students enrolled in a course in research methods in 1968. A total of ten cases either did not cooperate or could not be interviewed for various reasons. Additional information was gathered from various other sources, including the municipal government, in 1968 and 1969.

Neighborhood was defined as a residential block, and neighborhood socioeconomic status was measured by arithmetic mean of the occupational prestige scores of the household heads, using the NORC scale, in the block. Racial composition was indexed by the proportion of the households headed by black persons in the block, and residential mobility of neighborhood was the proportion of the households that moved to the community within the past ten years or/and plan to move from the community within a foreseeable future. In actual analysis of the data, socioeconomic status and mobility were dichotomized with the resulting pairs of categories including "high" and "low"

neighborhoods and "mobile" and "stable" neighborhoods. An effort was made to avoid artifacts in the grouping procedure by trying more than one cutting points and making sure that the results of analysis are not affected by the arbitrary cutting points adopted. Racial composition of neighborhood was either dichotomized with "segregated" and "desegregated" neighborhoods or trichotomized with "segregated," "nearly desegregated,"[11] and "desegregated" neighborhoods. Individual socioeconomic status and residential mobility were measured based on the same information and these variables were also dichotomized in the same way.

Racial attitude was measured by a Likert scale of 28 items, including the 16 items from the Anti-Negro Scale by Steckler (Shaw and Wright, 1967: 367-369), and neighborhood interaction was measured by three items from the Guttman Scale for Measuring Women's Neighborliness by Wallin (Miller, 1970: 298-300). Again, both of these variables were dichotomized in actual analysis of the data with the resulting pairs of categories including "prejudiced" and "not prejudiced," "active" and "inactive" interaction. The results have been analyzed by chi-square, gamma, partial gamma (Davis, 1967), d% (percentage differences), and the Dorn-Stouffer-Tibbits-Goodman Method for testing significance of interaction effects (Goodman, 1961).

3. Results and Discussion

Table 1 summarizes the variables used in the present analysis with their clasifications and frequency distributions. The distributions are less even in racial composition of neighborhoods, beflecting the objective situation in the community. The uneven distribution of racial attitudes reflects the

---

[11] This category includes five segregated blocks adjoining all-black or already desegregated blocks. The reason of this trichotomy will be discussed later.

fact that the distribution of the attitude scores was concentrated in the middle of the range.

"Table 1 about here"

In order to isolate the contextual effect of neighborhood socioeconomic status from that of individual socioeconomic status on racial attitudes, Table 2 presents the relevant data by first dividing the neighborhoods into "high" and "low" categories and then dividing individuals into "high" and "low" within each type of neighborhood.[12] Table 3 summarizes the statistical tests of the relationships involving these two variables as independent variables, neighborhood interaction as an intervening variable, and racial attitudes as the dependent variable. A comparison of C-9 (Row C, Column 9) with C-8 (Row C, Column 8) of Table 2 shows that individuals with low SES are more prejudiced than those with high SES, regardless of their neighborhood SES. And according to Table 3 (Row B), this relationship is statistically significant with a negative gamma. This is in accordance with the existing research evidence reviewed earlier.

"Tables 2 and 3 about here"

The two tables also show that regardless of their own individual SES, individuals of low SES neighborhoods are significantly more prejudiced than those of high SES neighborhoods - C-4 and C-7 of Table 2 and Row A of Table 3. It is quite possible, however, that the second result is due to the first one, because high SES neighborhoods consist of mostly high SES individuals. More meaningful comparisons, therefore, are those between high SES individuals living in high SES neighborhoods (C-2, Table 2) and high SES individuals living in low SES neighborhoods (C-5, Table 2) on the one hand and between low SES individuals living in high SES neighborhoods (C-3, Table 2) and low SES individuals living in low SES neighborhoods (C-6, Table 2) on the other.

---

12 This scheme follows that of Blau (1960).

According to Table 3, the former difference is not statistically significant (Row C, Table 3), while the latter remains significant (Row D, Table 3). The fact that one difference is not significant and the other is significant does not necessarily mean that the difference of differences is statistically significant. This was tested by the DSTG Method and the result indicates that the interaction effect of neighborhood SES
and individual SES on racial attitudes) is significant (Row E, Table 3).

Based on these results, it is tentatively concluded that neighborhood SES does have a contextual effect on racial attitudes of white housewives toward the black, at least among those with low individual SES, above and beyond the effect of their individual SES. In other words, neighborhood SES has a greater contextual effect upon low SES individuals than high SES individuals. The partial relationship that has survived so far - namely, the relationship between neighborhood SES and racial attitudes among low SES - was further tested with neighborhood interaction as another test variable. It was argued previously that neighborhood norms are enforced upon individual residents through their interaction. It is expected, therefore, that the above partial relationship be stronger among those with active neighborhood interaction than those with inactive interaction. Comparisons of A-3 with A-6 on the one hand and B-3 with B-6 on the other (Table 2) provide the data to test these predictions. According to Rows F, G, and I of Table 3, the results are in accordance with these predictions.

These results are tentative for a number of reasons. First, some of the results, such as that the contextual effect of neighborhood SES on racial attitudes is significant among low SES individuals but not among high SES individuals, are post factum findings that have not been predicted or explained.

Second, it is conceivable that tests employing more direct indices of neighborhood socioeconomic status, their normative climates, and neighborhood interaction taking into account the other parties of the interaction, may show different results. Third, the research design presented here does not exclude the possibility that neighborhood interaction is actually consequence rather than an intervening variable; neither can the possibility that these relations are spurious due to some other variables be excluded.

The tests to examine racial composition of the neighborhood as a contextual variable involve only white persons. This means that racial identity as an individual variable has been controlled al ready. Despite ~~of~~ this simplification, the results seem to be less clear in this case than in the previous case involving SES as a contextual variable. There are only five desegregated neighborhoods representing 29 individuals (out of 231 individuals) in the sample, and this means that there is not much variation in this variable. When neighborhoods were dichotomized into "segregated" and "desegregated" neighborhoods, no significant differences between the two types of neighborhoods in terms of racial attitudes of the residents was observed.[13] When neighborhood SES was controlled, there ~~wee~~ were no desegregated neighborhoods with high SES, and the partial test was incomplete. When only low SES neighborhoods were included in the test, still there was no significant relationship between racial composition of neighborhood and racial attitudes of the residents.[14]

---

[13] Of those living in segregated neighborhoods, 40.1% are prejudiced, as against 41.4% of those living in desegregated neighborhoods found in the same category. The difference is not statistically significant.

[14] Of those living in segregated neighborhoods, 50.6% are prejudice, as against 41.4% of those living in desegregated neighborhoods found in the same category. The difference is not statistically significant.

A careful re-examination of the data, however, brought out a third category of ~~the~~ residents who are distinctively more prejudiced tha n ~~the~~ others. Many of them were found in nearly desegregated areas on a map. Based on this post-factum observation, it was decided that racial composition be trichotomized with three categories of "segregated," "nearly desegregated," and "desegregated." Table 4 and Table 5 summarize the results of the comparisons of these categories in terms of their racial attitudes. A comparison of three columns (Columns 2, 3, and 4, Table 4) of the marginal row (Row C, Table 4) reveals that of those living in "nearly desegregated" neighborhoods, 78.3% are prejudiced, while only 39.3% of those in "segregated" neighborhoods and 41.4% of those in "desegregated"neighborhoods were found in the same category. Separate chi-sqaure tests indicate that those in "nearly desegregated" neighborhoods are significantly different from the others, and the corresponding gamma tests indicate that they are more prejudiced than the others (Row A, Table 5).

"Tables 4 and 5 about here"

When neighborhood interaction was introduced as another test variable, the results were unexpected. The relationship between racial composition and racial attitudes is not significant when neighborhood interaction is active (Row B, Table 5), while it remained significant among those with inactive neighborhood interaction (Row C, Table 5). The interaction effect between racial composition and neighborhood interaction on racial attitudes tested by the DSTG Method (Row D, Table 5), however, is not significant. And so is the partial gamma between racial composition and racial attitudes with neighborhood interaction partialed out.[15] The only tentative conclusion that can be drawn from these results, therefore, is that ~~these~~ white housewives in nearly desegregated neighborhoods are more

---

15 This is different from the conditional gamma given in Row C, Table 5. Partial gammas were computed only when there is no interaction effects present,

prejudiced than ~~the~~ others when their neighborhood interaction is inactive. There is no theoretical explanation to account for this unexpected result. It is open to any one's speculation. It may be that the prevailing norms in racially different neighborhoods, in distinction from socioeconomically different neighborhoods, are not enforced through neighborhood interaction. Or, it may be that those who live in nearly desegregated neighborhoods, who are threatened by encroaching blacks, tend to have less neighborhood interaction than those in the other neighborhoods. More theory and research are needed before more definite conclusions can be drawn.

"Tables 6 and 7 about here"

Table 6 and Table 7 test and summarize the relationships involving residential mobility, neighborhood SES, neighborhood interaction, and racial attitudes. A comparison of C-8 with C-9, Table 6, indicates that "mobile" individuals are less prejudiced than "stable" individuals, regardless of their neighborhood residential mobility (Row B, Table 7). Also, a comparison of C-4 with C-7, Table 6, indicates that those in "stable" neighborhoods are more prejudiced than those in "mobile" neighborhoods, regardless of their individual mobility (Row A, Table 7). These results, considering the Southern background of the community, are not entirely incomprehensible. Residential mobility, however, is related to social mobility, which is in turn related to SES, and since SES is also related to racial attitudes, this raises the possibility that the above results may be attributable to the differences of SES of neighborhoods or individuals in different mobility categories. Rows F, G, and I of Table 7 present the results of partial analyses using low SES neighborhoods only. The results indicate that both of the partial relationships between neighborhood mobility and the racial attitudes among mobile individuals and among

---

because if it can be shown that the A, B association is different for different categories of C, then a weighted average of the measures of associations between A and B is not an appropria te summary of the relationship.

stable individuals are not statistically significant. Neither is the interaction effect between neighborhood mobility and individual mobility on racial attitudes significant.

Furthermore, when individual mobility is held constant, the relationship between neighborhood mobility and racial attitudes (comparing C-2 with C-5 and C-3 with C-6, Table 6) is not statistically significant (Row C, Table 7). Since all of the main relationships are not significant at this point, no further effort was made to re-examine the relationship with neighborhood interaction as another test variable.

4. Conclusions

Based on the data analyzed in this paper, the following tentative conclusions are presented for further investigations:

(1) High SES white housewives are less prejudiced against the black than low SES white housewives, regardless of their neighborhood SES.

(2) Those white housewives living in high SES neighborhoods are less prejudiced against the black than those in low SES neighborhoods, regardless of their individual SES.

(3) Neighborhood SES has a contextual effect on racial attitudes of low SES white housewives toward the black above and beyond the effects of their individual variables.

(4) The above contextual effect of neighborhood SES is greater when neighborhood interaction is active than when it is inactive.

(5) Those white housewives living in nearly desegregated neighborhoods are more prejudiced against the black than those in segregated or desegregated neighborhoods.

(6) Mobile white housewives are less prejudiced than stable housewives; and those white housewives in mobile neighborhoods are less prejudiced against the black than those in stable neighborhoods. The relationships, however, disappear when their individual mobility and/or neighborhood mobility are controlled.

The actual direction and strength of any contextual effect considered here may vary in different communities and regions. The above results, considered together, however, seem to support the basic assumption of this study that neighborhoods do have some contextual effects upon individual racial attitudes above and beyond the effects of their individual variables.

The question of how important are social situational factors, such as neighborhoods, as against personality factors, in understanding and changing racial relations is an old one. Sociologists tend to emphasize the former by showing how specific racial attitudes change after the fact, e.g.: serving in the same Army company, living in the same neighborhood, or working together in the same empany with members of other races. On the other hand, psychologists tend to emphasize the latter by showing how authoritarian personality or frustration are related to racial prejudice and discrimination. The body of psychological knowledge is of course extremely helpful in explaining individual differences and in helping to treat individual problems of prejudice. But equally effective and workable, if not more so, is the situational approach, which tries to change social environments first and thereby to "force" individuals to change their attitudes. The present author hopes that this study sheds some additional light on the importance of immediate social situations, such as residential neighborhoods, in creating the kind of social environments which give rise to and sustain interracial relations that are free from prejudice and discrimination.

Table 1. Variables, Classifications, and Frequency Distributions

Contextual variables:		
Socioeconomic status:	High	123
	Low	108
Racial composition:	Segregated	179
	Nearly desegregated	23
	Desegregated	29
Residential mobility:	Mobile	123
	Stable	108
Individual variables:		
Socioeconomic status:	High	125
	Low	106
Residential mobility:	Mobile	116
	Stable	115
Neighborhood interaction:	Active	115
	Inactive	116
Racial attitudes	Prejudiced	95
	Less prejudiced	136

Table 2. Socioeconomic Status of Neighborhood and Individual, Neighborhood Interaction, and Racial Attitudes - Percentage "Prejudiced". (The number in parentheses indica te the number of cases from which percentages have been computed.)

Neighborhood Interaction	High SES (neb)*			Low SES (neb)			SES (neb) Combined		
	High SES (ind)*	Low SES (ind)	SES (ind) Combined	High SES (ind)	Low SES (ind)	SES(ind) Combined	High SES (ind)	Low SES (ind)	SES(ind) Combined
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
(A) Active	35.0 (60)	16.7 (12)	31.9 (72)	21.4 (14)	58.6 (29)	46.5 (43)	32.4 (74)	46.3 (41)	37.4 (115)
(B) Inactive	37.1 (35)	43.8 (16)	39.2 (51)	43.8 (16)	51.0 (49)	49.2 (65)	39.2 (51)	49.2 (65)	44.8 (116)
(C) Combined	35.8 (95)	32.1 (28)	34.9 (123)	33.3 (30)	53.8 (78)	48.1 (108)	35.2 (125)	48.1 (106)	41.1 (231)

* SES (neb)= Neighborhood socioeconomic status.
SES (ind)= Individual socioeconomic status.

Table 3. Summary of Statistical Tests of Relationships Involving SES (neb)*, SES (ind)*, Neighborhood Interaction, and Racial Attitudes.

Relationship	Test statistic	Level of significance
(A) SES (neb) - Racial attitudes:	$X^2 = 4.13$ G = -.33**	$p < .05$
(B) SES (ind) - Racial attitude:	$X^2 = 3.95$ G = -.26	$p < .05$
* *		
(C) SES (neb) - Racial attitudes among "high" SES (ind):	$X^2 = 0.06$	n.s.
(D) SES (neb) - Racial attitudes among "low" SES (ind):	$X^2 = 3.88$ G = -.42	$p < .05$
(E) Interaction effect of SES (neb) and SES (ind) on Racial attitudes:	DSTG Z= 1.68***	$p < .05$
(F) SES (neb) - Racial attitudes among "low" SES (ind) when Neighborhood interaction is "active":	$X^2 = 6.00$	$p < .05$
(G) SES (neb) - Racial attitudes among "low" SES (ind) when Neighborhood interaction is "inactive":	$X^2 = 0.25$	n. s.
(I) Interaction effect of SES (neb) and Neighborhood interaction on Racial attitudes of "low" SES (ind):	DSTG Z= 1.50***	$p < .07$

* SES (neb)= Neighborhood socioeconomic status. SES (ind)= Individual socioeconomic status.
**G=gamma is given only when X^2 is significant.
*** DSTG= Dorn-Stouffer-Tibbitts-Goodman Method for testing significance of interaction effects (Goodman, 1961)

Table 4. Racial Composition of Neighborhood, Neighborhood Interaction, and Racial Attitudes in "Low" Socioeconomic Neighborhoods - Percentage "Prejudiced". (The numbers in parentheses indicate the number from which percentages have been computed.)

Neighborhood Interaction (1)	Segregated (2)	Nearly Desegregated (3)	Desegregated (4)	Combined (5)
(A) Active	33.3 (21)	72.7 (11)	45.4 (11)	46.5 (43)
(B) Inactive	42.8 (35)	83.3 (12)	38.9 (18)	49.2 (65)
(C) Combined	39.3 (56)	78.3 (23)	41.4 (29)	48.1 (108)

Table 5. Summary of Statistical Tests of Relationships Involving Racial Composition of Neighborhood, Neighborhood Interaction, and Racial Attitudes in "Low" Socioeconomic Neighborhoods.

Relationship	Test statistic	Level of significance
(A) Racial composition - Racial attitudes:	$X^2 = 10.65$ G = -.15*	p < .01
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *		
(B) Racial composition - Racial attitudes when Neighborhood interaction is "active":	$X^2 = 4.50$	n.s.
(C) Racial composition - Racial attitudes when Neighborhood interaction is "inactive":	$X^2 = 6.95$ G = -.07*	p < .05
(D) Interaction effect of Racial composition and Neighborhood interaction on Racial attitudes:	DSTG Z**	n.s.
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *		
(E) Racial composition - Racial attitudes with Neighborhood interaction partialed out:	G segregation, racial attitudes | neighborhood interaction = -.14***	n.s.

*G=gamma is given only when X^2 is significant. The low G is due to the fact that the relationship is not monotonic.
**DSTG=Dorn-Stouffer-Tibbits-Goodman Method for testing for significance of interaction effects (Goodman, 1961) The partial tables were collapsed by combining all possible pairs of categories for this test. None of the combinations produced a significant Z.
*** Partial gamma is given only when DSTG Z is not significant. The standard error of partial gamma was computed by the formula given by Rosenthal (1966).

Table 6. Residential Mobility of Neighborhood and Individual, Neighborhood Interaction, and Racial Attitudes - Percentage "Prejudiced". (The numbers in parentheses indicate the number of cases from which percentages have been computed.)

Neighborhood Interaction	Mobile (neb)*			Stable (neb)*			Combined (neb)*		
	Mobile (ind)*	Stable (ind)*	Combined (ind)*	Mobile (ind)	Stable (ind)	Combined (ind)	Mobile (ind)	Stable (ind)	Combined (ind)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
(A) Active	32.6 (43)	45.4 (11)	35.2 (54)	33.3 (12)	40.8 (49)	39.3 (61)	32.7 (55)	41.7 (60)	37.4 (115)
(B) Inactive	24.5 (49)	45.0 (20)	30.4 (69)	50.0 (12)	71.4 (35)	65.9 (47)	29.5 (61)	61.8 (55)	44.8 (116)
(C) Combined	28.3 (92)	45.2 (31)	32.5 (123)	41.7 (24)	53.6 (84)	50.9 (108)	31.0 (116)	47.2 (115)	41.1 (231)

* Mobile (neb)=Mobile neighborhood.
Stable (neb)=Stable neighborhood.
Combined (neb)= Neighborhoods combined.
Mobile (ind)=Mobile individual.
Stable (ind)=Stable individual
Combined (ind)=Individuals combined.

Table 7. Summary of Statistical Tests of Relationships Involving Residential Mobility of Neighborhoods and Individual, Neighborhood Interaction, and Racial Attitudes.

Relationship	Test statistic	Level of significance
(A) Mobility (neb)* - Racial attitudes:	$X^2 = 8.04$ G = -.36**	$p < .01$
(B) Mobility (ind)* - Racial attitudes:	$X^2 = 6.58$ G = -.33	$p < .05$
	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	
(C) Mobility (neb) - Racial attitudes among "mobile" individuals:	$X^2 = 3.66$	n. s.
(D) Mobility (neb) - Racial attitudes among "stable" individuals:	$X^2 = 1.05$	n. s.
(E) Interaction effect of Mobility (neb) and Mobility (ind) on Racial attitudes:	DSTG Z=0.33***	n. s.
	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	
In "low" SES (neb)* -		
(F) Mobility (neb) - Racial attitudes among "mobile" individuals:	$X^2 = 2.11$	n. s.
(G) Mobility (neb) - Racial attitudes among "stable" individuals:	$X^2 = 1.96$	n. s.
(I) Interaction effect of Mobility (neb) and Mobility (ind) on Racial attitudes:	DSTG Z= 0.12***	n. s.

*Mobility (neb)= Neighborhood mobility.
Mobility (ind)= Individual mobility.
SES (neb)= Neighborhood socioeconomic status.
**G=gamma is given only when X^2 is significant.
***DSTG=Dorn-Stouffer-Tibbits-Goodman Method for testing significance of interaction effects (Goodman, 1961).

REFERENCES

Allport, G. W.
1958 The Nature of Prejudice. New York: Doubleday & Co.

Bettelheim, Bruno and Janowitz, Morris
1964 Social Change and Prejudice. New York: Free Press.

Blalock, H. M.
1957 "Per cent non-white and discrimination in the South." American Sociological Review 22 (December): 677-682.

Blalock, H. M.
1967 Toward A Theory of Minority-group Relations. New York: John Wiley.

Blau, P. M.
1956 "Social mobility and interpersonal relations." American Sociological Review 21 (June): 290-295.

Blau, P. M.
1960 "Structural effects." American Sociological Review 25 (April): 178-193.

Coleman, J. S.
1958 "Relational analysis: The study of social organizations with survey methods." Human Organization 17 (Spring): 28-36.

Coleman, J. S. et al.
1966 Equality of Educational Opportunity. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Cook, S. W.
1962 "The systematic analysis of socially significant events: A strategy for social research." Journal of Social Issues 18 (Spring): 66-85.

Davis, J. A.
1961 "Compositional effects, role systems, and the survival of small discussion groups." Public Opinion Quarterly 25: 574-584.

Davis, J. A.
1967 "A partial coefficient for Goodman and Kruskal's Gamma." Journal of the American Statistical Association 62 (March): 189-193.

Deutscher, I.
1966 "Words and deeds: Social science and social policy." Social Problems 13 (Winter): 235-254.

Deutsch, Morton, and Collins, M. W.
1951 Interracial Housing. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Durkheim, Emile
1950 The Rules of Sociological Method. Glencoe, Ill: Pree Press.

Fendrich, J. M.
1967 "A study of the association among verbal attitudes, commitment and overt behavior in different experimental situations." Social Forces 45 (March): 347-355.

Goodman, L. A.
1961 "Modifications of the Dorn-Stouffer-Tibbits Method for 'testing the significance of comparisons in sociological data.'" American Journal of Sociology 66 (January): 355-359.

Greenblum, Joseph and Pearlin, Leonard
1953 "Vertical mobility and prejudice: A socio-psychological analysis." 480-491 in Bendix, Reinhard and Lipset, Seymour (eds.), Class, Status, and Power. New York: Free Press.

Hamblin, R. J.
1962 "The dynamics of racial discrimination." Social Problems 10 (Fall): 103-121.

Hodge, R. W. and Treiman, Donald.
1966 "Occupational mobility and attitudes toward Negroes." American Sociological Review 31 (February): 93-102.

Hunt, C. L.
1960 "Private integrated housing." Social Problems 7 (Spring): 196-209.

Kendall, P. L. and Lazarsfeld, P. F.
1950 "Problems of survey analysis." pp. 133-196 in Merton, R. K. and Lazarsfeld, P. F. (eds.) Continuities in Social Research: Studies in the Scope and Method of 'The American Soldier.' Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.

Landis, J. R. et al.
1966 Race and social class as determinants of social distance. Sociology and Social Research 51 (October): 78-86.

LaPiere, R. T.
1934 "Attitudes vs action." Social Forces 13 (December): 230-237.

Lazarsfeld, P. F. and Menzel, Herbert
1961 "On the relation between individual and collective properties." 499-516 in Etzioni, Amitai (ed.) Complex Organizations, New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Lohman, J. D. and Reitzes, D. C.
1952 "Note on race relations in mass society." American Journal of Sociology 58 (November): 240-246.

Miller, D. C.
1970 Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement. New York: McKay.

Northwood, L. K.
1958 "Ecological and attitudinal factors in church desegregation." Social Problems 6 (Fall): 150-163.

Packard, Vance.
1959 The Status Seekers. New York: McKay.

Robinson, W. S.
1950 "Ecological correlations and the behaviors of individuals " American Sociological Review 15 (June): 351-357.

Pettigrew, T. F.
1966 "Complexity and change in American racial patterns: A social psychological view." 325-359 in Parsons, T. and Clark, K. B. (eds.) The Negro American. Boston: Beacon Press.

Taeuber, K. E. and Taeuber, A. F.
1965 Negroes in Cities. Chicago: Aldine

Rosenthal, I.
1966 "The distribution of the sample version of the measure of association, Gamma," Journal of the American Statistical Association 61 (March): 440-454.

Saenger, G. and Shulman, H. M.
1948 "Some factors determining intercultural behavior and attitudes of members of different ethnic groups in mixed neighborhoods." Journal of Psychology 25 (April): 365-380.

Schuman, Howard and Gruenberg, Barry
1970 "The impact of city on racial attitudes" American Journal of Sociology 76 (September): 213-261.

Sewell, W. H. and Armer, J. M.
1966 "Neighborhood context and college plans." American Sociological Review 31 (April): 159-168.

Shaw, M. E. and Wright, J. M.
1967 Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Sheatsley, P. B.
1966 "White attitudes toward the Negro," 303-324 in Parsons, T., and Clark, K. B. (eds.) The Negro American. Boston: Beacon Press.

Silberstein, F. B. and Seeman, Melvin
1959 "Social mobility and prejudice." American Journal of Sociology 65 (November): 258-264.

Sills, D. L.
1961 "Three 'climate of opinion' studies." Public Opinion Quarterly 25: 571-573.

Stouffer, S. A., et al.
1949 The American Soldier. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press.

Triands, H. S. and Triands, L. M.
1960 "Race, social class, religion, and nationality as determinants of social distance." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 61: 110-118.

Tumin, Melvin
1958 Desegregation: Resistance and Readiness. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press.

Warner, L. G. and DeFleur, M. L.
1969 "Attitude as an interactional concept: Social constraint and social distance as intervening variables between attitudes and action." American Sociological Review 34 (April): 153-169.

Webb, E. J., et al.
1970 Unobtrusive Measures: Nonreactive Research in The Social Sciences. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co.'

Williams, R. M., Jr.
1964 Strangers Next Door. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall.

Wilson, A. B.
1959 "Residential segregation of social classes and aspirations of high school boys." American Sociological Review 24 (December): 836-845.